

The Shakespeare Newsletter

Vol. VIII: 5

"Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ."

November, 1958

Sir Anthony Eden Succeeds Lord Iliffe As Memorial Theatre President

Sir Anthony Eden former Prime Minister of Great Britain has succeeded Lord Iliffe as President of the Governors of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre Association. In responding to the toast in his honor Lord Iliffe, surveyed the history of the theatre during his twenty-five year term of office and noted that the Memorial Theatre has never had a subsidy, and that it has grown from a provincial theatre to one of international importance. Earlier economic difficulties ended when after the disastrous fire of 1926 the new theatre was financed with 250,000 pounds, four-fifths of which was raised in the United States.

At the retirement ceremony, Sir Fordham Flower, Chairman of the Executive Council, presented Lord Iliffe with a silver model of the Memorial Theatre. Made to a scale of 1/350, the 75 foot theatre tower stands but three inches high in the scale model. The model rests on an oval marble base 9x12". The model was made in Birmingham by Stanley G. Morris. It took three months to make.

It was announced that 367,825 had attended the plays in the 1957-58 season for an average of 10,079 per week, 92% of capacity. The figures are for 52 weeks and thus includes some miscellaneous performances.

High Praise For Sir John Gielgud's "Seven Ages of Man"
Thunderous applause resounded in the Stratford Festival Theatre in Canada when on September 21 Sir John Gielgud opened his program of readings entitled "The Seven Ages of Man." The Knight whom *The New York Times* reviewer called "the finest classical actor of the English-speaking world" took his program from George Ryland's anthology—*The Ages of Man*.

As the program progressed and Sir John became more accustomed to the unfamiliar festival stage the reader became more an actor, never forgetting, as he said, "the language, the rhythm . . . the single word." Abandoning virtually all gesture, all settings, all effects, and concentrating merely on the verse. Sir John gave a performance which the critic declared "held us enchanted leading us to planes of high emotion as well as of lofty poetic expression."

This was the noted actor's first return to America after six years.

The last section gave aspects of death from the roles of Claudio (*M for M*), J.C., RII, Hamlet, Romeo in the tomb scene, *KL*, and Macbeth's "Tomorrow, tomorrow . . ." Other roles were Othello before the Senate, Hotspur raging, HVI's pastoral regret, Wolsey in disgrace, et.al.

King Lear in the Village

The Players Theatre, formerly the Shakespearewrights, open an 8 week run of *King Lear* at their new home, 115 McDougall St., NYC. Donald Goldman is the producer, Philip Lawrence is directing.

Stratford Memorial Theatre Appoints 27 Year Old Peter Hall To Succeed Shaw

Glen Byam Shaw, director of the Stratford Memorial Theatre since 1952, has recommended 27 year old Peter Hall to succeed him as Director of the theatre. The appointment will take effect at the conclusion of the 100th season in 1959.

Shakespeare Memorial Theatre Company To Visit Moscow and Leningrad

At the invitation of the Ministry of Culture of the U.S.S.R., the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre Company in association with the British Council will perform in Moscow and Leningrad after the current season closes on Nov. 29.

The company of seventy, including 42 actors, will fly from London on Dec. 8 and open in Leningrad's Palace of Culture on Dec. 12. After eleven performances of *Romeo & Juliet*, *Hamlet*, and *Twelfth Night*, they will open at the Moscow Art Theatre on Christmas Eve. They will return to England on January 9. Glen Byam Shaw is directing *R&J* and *Hamlet*, and Peter Hall is directing *TN*. Michael Redgrave, Dorothy Tutin, Richard Johnson, Angela Baddeley, Geraldine McEwan, and Rachel Kempson are among the cast.

Twenty-eight tons of scenery and 350 costumes are being shipped to Russia for the productions.

Although the Company has acted in twelve countries during the past five years this will be its first visit to Russia. It will be the first leading company to act in Leningrad since the Revolution. Director Solodovnikov suggested the visit when he attended a performance of *R&J* earlier this year.

NEW BOOKS ISSUED BY THE FOLGER SHAKESPEARE LIBRARY

To make its materials and the latest authoritative information available to wide audiences, The Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D. C., is publishing a series of booklets for non-specialists. Under the general series title of Folger Booklets on Tudor and Stuart Civilization six of the attractive 5x8 1/2" booklets have already been issued: *The Life of Shakespeare* by Giles E. Dawson, *English Dress in the Age of Shake-*

speare by Virginia A. LaMar, *Music in Elizabethan England* by Dorothy E. Mason, *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century* and *The Bible in English 1525-1611* by Craig R. Thompson, and *Shakespeare's Theatre and the Dramatic Tradition* by Louis B. Wright, Director of the Library.

Each of the volumes contains about 16 pages of text, from 13 to 22 plates, and from 36 to 58 pages. A suggestive bibliography follows the text. Price of each is 75c. The library is also preparing color slides and is increasing the number of postcards and prints already available.

Shakespeare Book Wins

1957 Explicator Award
Professor Harold S. Wilson of the University of Toronto was presented the 1957 *Explicator* Award for his recent book on the Design of Shakespearean Tragedy.

The \$200 award is made annually by *The Explicator*, a magazine devoted to the critical word-by-word, line-by-line analysis of literary works which is the special feature of *explication de texte*.

The author is at present on the faculty of the University of Toronto. He has also taught at Grinnell, the University of Nebraska, Northwestern, and Harvard. He is a member of the Editorial Board of *The Shakespeare Quarterly* and was a Fellow at the Folger Shakespeare Library in 1957. His book was published by the University of Toronto Press.

Season's Greetings To All

Peter Hall has already directed *Love's Labour's Lost* (1956), *Cymbeline* (1957), and *Twelfth Night* (1958) at the Stratford showplace. His reputation was gained as an amateur director at Cambridge and the Marlowe Society and later at the Windsor Repertory Company, the Elizabethan Theatre Company, the Arts Theatre of London, Sadler's Wells, and elsewhere.

Mr. Hall spoke of maintaining the traditions built up at the theatre during the past twelve years, but all playgoers may well expect changes. Mr. Hall declared last April that both the Memorial Theatre and the Old Vic are too large and wrongly designed for Shakespearean performances. *Shakespeare Newsletter* readers will remember that it was Mr. Hall who envisioned a Memorial Theatre so rich that it could afford to raze the current structure—completed in 1932—and build a new one in its place. (Our editorial, "Stage vs. Study," May, 1958).

The Director-elect told the *Stratford-upon-Avon Herald* (Nov. 21) that "It is any director's ambition to run a theatre; only by so doing can you establish a style and tradition of your own."

Although there have been attempts to enlarge the apron of the stage, productions are still set behind the proscenium arch.

New Successes at San Diego's National Shakespeare Festival

The most successful Shakespeare festival in the San Diego Community Theatre's nine year history was concluded on Aug. 31 with a grand total of 16,000 admissions. The final two weeks of the six-week festival played to capacity audiences with hundreds turned away from the small 400-seat Old Globe replica theatre.

Macbeth, *Much Ado*, and *Antony and Cleopatra* were equally popular, each playing to over 5000 spectators. The little theatre was filled to an average 88% of capacity for the season.

Henry Hewes (*Sat. Rev.*, Aug. 23, p. 28) in reviewing the festivals at Oregon and San Diego found that for the "sophisticated playgoer" there were occasional "disturbing shortcomings."

At Oregon he found "too much grandiloquent gesture, and performing of the meaning of each line rather than the situation in which it is spoken." At San Diego the acting was frequently "overly obvious, with the actors underlining and straining at the making of a point." The best performers of each company, he thought, "could be intermingled with those of the more professional Eastern festivals to our advantage."

Editorial:

ORTHODOXIES IN STAGING

Prompted by some remarks of ours in recent editorials, *New York Times* drama critic, Brooks Atkinson wrote to us recently and declared that "I don't understand why anybody should be upset by acting Shakespeare plays in any kind of costume or period. They were originally played for the most part in contemporary Elizabethan costumes, which established one sort of standard. When Garrick acted them in eighteenth century dress, he was doing the equivalent thing, but scholars would scream 'foul' today. To act them today in Elizabethan costume is to set up ritualistic standards that may be historically correct but throw the plays out of focus dramatically. To me the only thing that matters is whether they make a stimulating evening in the theatre. *I'm against orthodoxies of all kinds.*" (The italics are ours.)

The comment stirs up a welter of ideas. Certainly the scholar expects as stimulating an evening in the theatre as the drama critic, and theoretically he does not care whether the costume and setting be in Mexico, Urbania, Illyria, Renaissance Italy or 20th century London so long as the lines are not uttered in Mumbleshire dialect. But some verisimilitude is required. To set *Julius Caesar* in modern dress is interesting, but to say that the play has no excuse for a hearing unless the theme of modern dictator is emphasized is not to understand Shakespeare and to have a narrow concept of cultural history. When the 17th and 18th century actors garbed their actors in the then current costumes they did so *not* because they were attempting to make the plays *modern* but because they knew no different. Although Richard III, Falstaff, and Henry VIII were traditionally dressed according to their historical periods, and the early 17th century illustration of *Titus Andronicus* shows up some characters in traditional Roman dress, for the most part, we are told by Gilliland, that in Garrick's day no one thought of complaining when "some very neat Bond-street shops appeared two, or three times, as parts of Rome." Even if Garrick as Lear wore knee-breeches, scarlet coat, and the rest of the trimmings, if Macready was first to wear a beard in the role, if Quinn did Othello in a "large powdered major wig," and if Kemble played Hamlet in modern court dress, we must remember that except for more lone voices, this was not at all disconcerting to the audience. If for 150 years in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries Shakespeare *was* done in "modern dress" we can at least say that the producers were consistent. Their effects were *not* achieved by staging and dress alone but by acting. True they did have their mechanical devices, their tempests, and their processions, but these were used in the few plays that required them. Early attempts at verisimilitude in the Drury Lane *Julius Caesar* of 1723 included a prophet of ancient Rome, and again in 1738 there were "Scenes and Decorations proper to the Play." Macklin had in 1741 delved deeply into Renaissance lore for the costume of his Shylock and was first to wear kilts and tartans in his 1793 *Macbeth*, never to be repeated until Phelps' production in 1848.

But these were unusual and in 1789 "Dramaticus" in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for May could still deplore Richard III's army in current uniforms while Richard himself was properly attired. And "Dramaticus" went on to inquire whether it was "possible to reconcile Macbeth and Hamlet dressed in our fashionable short coats, with the idea of habits of ages so far anterior."

Times changed slowly, but with the new romanticism of the late 18th century demanding realism, with Garrick abandoning chandeliers in favor of head lights and border battens, with Boydell's artists illustrating Shakespeare historically in hundreds of paintings, with imported stage designers bringing in new ideas, and with the introduction of gas in 1817-18, more and more of the stage became clearly visible and more and more was demanded. So elaborate did production become that even when Charles Kean retired in 1859 his farewell speech attempted an answer to those who had clamored loudly that his productions had detracted from Shakespeare. The later excesses of Irving and Tree are today not often repeated, but there are still productions in which the producers still pay as much if not more attention to those who come for the spectacle as to those who come for Shakespeare.

Admittedly the lines of Shakespeare tell us that Casca, Coriolanus, and Hamlet wore doublets, that Cleopatra wore petticoats, and that characters in Pericles wore ruffs. It certainly indicates that Shakespeare lacked historical perspective, but it does not give us license to do as we please, especially if it *diminishes credibility* and draws our attention FROM the lines and characters TO the decor and method of production.

The situation has changed somewhat. Producers do know better. But all of us have seen productions where the stage and costume designer have been given more prominence than the play. And many of us have also seen productions at Ashland, Antioch, San Diego, Canada, and elsewhere where Shakespeare has been served equally well with a mere tree, throne, or banner for setting and pleasing but not obtrusive garments for costume.

We are not alone in thinking that it is unnecessary to place every succeeding production of a given play in another age and another country for the sake of novelty. Should opposition to orthodoxy sanction novelty for its own sake or should it rather mean opposition only when a better production is thereby possible? Does it mean that Salvini should have been permitted to cut his throat because a Moor could not stab himself with a curved Moorish scimitar (and thereby prevent him from uttering his final lines), or that King Lear should be permitted in Erewhon, or that Hamlet in white tie and tails should also wear a rapier and dagger? The opposite of orthodoxy is license, and license often leads to inanities. The purpose of the decor is to draw attention to the actor and his lines, not to itself. "The play's the thing. . . ."

P.S. To Our Open Letter

The response to our Open Letter in the last issue was a welcome stimulus to our activities. We heartily thank all those who sent renewals and especially those who sent the student and gift subscriptions so necessary to keep SNL going.

For those subscribers who did not immediately obey the impulse to write I have once again encircled the expiration date. Since we have sent only two renewal notices in over eight years of publishing, no one is obligated or under compulsion. However, we do hope that you will express some token of appreciation for continued service by sending even a partial payment to keep us aware of your continued interest in Shakespeare.

Biography in Brief:

FRANCES ANNE KEMBLE

Philip Highfill, Jr., *Geo. Washington Univ.*

Of all the Kemble kin, Fanny was the least interested in acting. Born to Charles Kemble and his wife Marie Therese De Camp on 27 November 1809, she was educated in France, and sequestered from the stage. She grew up on terms of intimacy with her Olympian aunt and uncle, Sarah Siddons and John Philip Kemble, and personages as varied as the Regent, Bentham, Mill, Tennyson, Fitzgerald and Thackeray. She learned French, Italian, Latin, studied dancing, the Bible, riding, marksmanship, and had her posture perfected by a sergeant of Foot Guards, with no thought of turning these graces to professional account.

After Charles Kemble took a major share in failing Covent Garden, the tiny, graceful girl of nineteen, who had already written an historical drama, but whose acting had been confined to one school triumph, was thrust on as Juliet to her father's *Mercutio*. Enormously successful in the winter of 1829 as Juliet, Portia, Belvidera, and Euphrasia, she wiped out a debt of 13,000 pounds. Expanding her repertoire to include Lady Macbeth, Portia, Beatrice, and Constance, she acquired an admiring claque of beaux, and her image appeared ubiquitously in journals and shop-windows, on handkerchiefs, cups, and fans. Hayter published drawings of her as Juliet, Mrs. Jameson wrote a panegyric accompaniment, and the ensemble sold madly.

Fanny accompanied her father to America in 1832, acting Shakespeare and melodrama to acclaim in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Montreal, and in Washington before Dolly Madison, J. Q. Adams, and Webster. She renewed acquaintance with Washington Irving and was passionately pursued by Shelley's friend Trevelyan. American audiences idolized her, and 13-year-old Walt Whitman thought that "Nothing finer did any stage ever exhibit." Fanny's fancy was captured by the dashing planter Pierce Butler. She married him, and retired for thirteen years, until he divorced her for desertion in 1848. Her fascinating journals from Georgia document the disintegration of the marriage because of her revulsion against slavery.

An older, more poised Katharine, a more poignant Mariana, returned to London in 1847. The experiment she began in reciting Shakespeare in 1848 made her name blaze with renewed brightness on two continents. Even as a young woman she had preferred reading Shakespeare over acting him; she had studied his work deeply at school, in conversations with H. H. Furness in Philadelphia, during exile in the southern wilderness; and she now approached her interpretations in a spirit of high dedication to his poetry's music and thought. Her musical training, incomparable voice, dark beauty, Kemblesque hauteur of bearing, and sober grandeur of costume combined into a new kind of theatricality. Audiences stood humbly for hours to jam her lectures, and for many years the Bard and Fanny Kemble were inseparable in the minds of her devoted. She died in London 15 January, 1893.

Notwithstanding her theory that "The dramatic faculty . . . lies in a power of apprehension quicker than the disintegrating process of critical analysis," she depended upon the insights of Johnson, Dyce, Hudson, Furness, and she left in *Notes on Shakespeare's Plays*, in memoirs, and in letters, much reflective criticism, as well as several poetic plays of her own. She stands alone among the greatest actors in the reluctance with which she entered the profession, the disdain in which she held most of its members, and her conviction that the stage "was partly from my nature, and partly from my education, so repugnant to me, that I failed to accomplish any result at all worthy of my many advantages." Reverence for her beloved Bard overcame repugnance, and for a long time between the death of Booth and the conversion of Daly, her work constituted a one-woman Shakespearean revival.

THE SHAKESPEARE NEWSLETTER

Published at Kent, Ohio

Editor and Publisher

LOUIS MARDER

Charles Stanley Felver, Assistant Editor

Department of English

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

Kent, Ohio

Six issues annually—Feb., April, May, Sept., Nov., Dec.—Annual Subscription \$1.00

Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office, Kent, Ohio

Vol. VIII—No. 5

November, 1958

Digest of

CRITICAL REVIEWS

Ed. by Mrs. Hanford Henderson, Gallaudet College

Friedman, William F. and Elizabeth S. The Shakespearean Ciphers Examined. New York and Cambridge University Press, 1957. 25s.

"This book will, I believe, become a standard work of reference. It is unique in its comprehensive treatment of its subject . . . The first chapter is a short general survey of the various 'anti-Stratfordian' claims for authors of the plays other than Shakespeare . . . followed by a chapter entitled 'Cryptology as a Science' in which are laid down in clear and simple form the tests by which the validity of a cryptanalytic solution is assessed. . . . In spite of the detail necessary for fair study of so many different attempts to find ciphers concealed in the First Folio . . . the book makes on the whole easy and entertaining reading. Many of the attempts immediately fail to convince when the light of objective scrutiny is shed on them, but the authors have held to their aim of full and fair treatment for all."

John H. Tiltman *Shakespeare Quarterly* IX (Spring '58) 187-8.

Dean, Leonard F. (ed.) Shakespeare: Modern Essays in Criticism. New York, Oxford University Press, 1957. \$2.65.

"It would be pointless to chide Professor Dean . . . for not having undertaken to represent systematically the leading currents in modern criticism of Shakespeare. . . . it may still be asked whether these twenty-eight selections compose a book that will, two decades hence, seem as lively and informative as Mrs. Anne Ridler's *Shakespeare Criticism 1919-1935*, Harley Granville-Barker's and Professor G. B. Harrison's *Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, or the *Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies* remain today. . . . Professor Dean's book . . . has its undeniable excellences. . . . yet the book as a whole is disappointing. Set it against a study such as Lord David Cecil's 'Shakespearean Comedy' . . . and the reason becomes apparent . . . Criticism at its best is no handmaiden of literature but literature itself The next such collection . . . may well take Lord David's essay as a worthy representative of the finest criticism of Shakespeare in our time."

Milton Crane *Shakespeare Quarterly* IX (Spring '58) 188-9.

Smith, Irwin, Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse. A Modern Reconstruction with Scale Drawings. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956. \$7.00.

" . . . in 1942 Dr. J. C. Adams published . . . *The Globe Playhouse: Its Design and Equipment* . . . an altogether new . . . idea of Elizabethan stage methods . . . it is therefore hardly surprising that it has been continuously . . . attacked Now, by way of answer to these attacks, Mr. Irwin Smith, Dr. Adams' collaborator, has brought out another book on the subject in which . . . he restates Dr. Adams' theory and provides . . . scale drawings of the Folger model . . . so fascinating . . . that it will be small wonder if the model is not very widely reproduced and the theory of staging that goes with it widely taught the Adams/Smith theory of Elizabethan staging upon which the whole of this reconstruction depends is in many respects . . . unsatisfactory . . . and the theory and the structure are so . . . interdependent that if any part of either is seriously discredited the whole thing collapses I do not quarrel with Mr. Smith's book because I think his model is erroneous but only because . . . there is no adequate warning given as to the very controversial nature of this reconstruction. I feel it would have been better if Mr. Smith had indicated that this should all be regarded rather as an experiment than as a historical fact."

C. Walter Hodges *Shakespeare Quarterly* IX (Spring '58) 194-7.

Mahood, M. M. Shakespeare's Wordplay. London, Methuen & Co., 1957. 18s.

"Miss Mahood's new book provides a divided reaction. . . . the book lacks definition round a clear centre; yet the mind behind it is obviously a lively and perceptive one, learned in both Shakespeare and the N. E. D. One's gratitude is, therefore, mixed with an awareness that such virtues have not their full outlet. . . . her conception of 'wordplay' is too general . . . to reveal any new line in wit criticism. Evidence selected from wordplay is loosely associated with other kinds of evidence to build up total pictures of complex meanings in the plays. . . . Perhaps the central problem of the book is that the author has tried to bridge a difficulty which lies at the heart of much mid-twentieth-century criticism. Miss Mahood has tried to write her book both as sensitive critic and as rigorous analyst, in a period when these roles tend to be mutually incompatible."

G. K. Hunter, *Mod. Lang. R.* (July '58) 426-27.

"When this book is going about its main business, it is excellent. The reader should not be thrown off by its occasional over-subtleties, or some pages which are little more than collections of particulars This is a selective study of Shakespeare's wordplay. The book opens with a perceptive and sensible chapter on Shakespeare's multiple meanings, and it asserts that a study of them can take us to the central experience of the play as surely as such things as imagery and explicit statement There is a concluding chapter on the contemporary attitudes toward words and on what, assuredly, Shakespeare's attitudes were Miss Mahood's enthusiasm for her subject does not lead her to a deification of it. . . . She does not write of wordplay as though it were the whole thing. . . . She sticks to the total experience of the play, of which wordplay is an integral part."

Edward Hubler, *Shakespeare Quarterly* (Spring 58) 192-3.

Wilson, Harold S. On the Design of Shakespearean Tragedy. London, Oxford University Press, 1957. 40s.

"There are, it is claimed [by Professor Wilson] two main groups of tragedies, Christian and non-Christian, the 'order of faith' and the 'order of nature'. To 'faith' belong *Romeo and Juliet*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Macbeth*; to 'nature' belong *Julius Caesar*, *Coriolanus*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Timon*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *King Lear*. Plays of the first group express the workings of Providence in man's world, and the idea of sin and retribution. The second group has its own divisions, earlier plays like *Julius Caesar* showing the 'pitiless perception of how common humanity defeats its own loftiest aspirations' . . . later plays like *Lear* moving towards an assertion of human dignity based upon a profound belief in the value of human love. In an important conclusion, Professor Wilson . . . [suggests] that . . . *Antony and Cleopatra* and *King Lear* imply Christianity without actually invoking it. . . . his thesis is a serious thesis which must affect any future discussion of the element of Christianity in Shakespeare's tragedies."

Philip Edwards, *Mod. Lang. R.* (July '58) 427-28.

William Poel As Director

Granville-Barker "recalled an occasion during the rehearsals for *Richard II* when the Duchess of Gloucester was pleading for her son's life. Poel was lying back in a deck-chair, his eyes shut, his hands crossed on his chest, his feet spread out. 'More hysteria,' he was saying, 'more hysteria,' and then a moment later, 'That's the tone, keep it up.' But Barker had to remind him gently that the lady was sobbing on the floor, and the hysteria was real."

From Robert Speaight, *William Poel and the Elizabethan Revival*, 1954, p. 70. Cambridge, U.S.A.

THE POACHER FROM STRATFORD

by
Frank W. Wadsworth

A Partial Account of the
Controversy over the
Authorship of
Shakespeare's Plays

This volume is a full account of the attempts to find a more obviously acceptable author of Shakespeare's plays and to show that the historical figure Shakespeare was only an impostor or frontman. Although the author forbears to attempt an exhaustive survey of the thousands of books and articles by the "anti-Stratfordians," he has given a clear and representative account of their main opinions and methods of thinking. After tracing the first doubts to their origins, he tells of Delia Bacon, who first propounded the claim that Sir Francis Bacon was the man responsible for the plays, and of William Henry Smith, who helped make the Baconian controversy a major intellectual diversion of the late nineteenth century.

Rather than arguing the case one way or the other, this volume gives an objective description of anti-Stratfordian methods, from the beginnings through prodigious efforts of "cryptography" to the most recent activities of researchers who pried open the tomb of Walsingham, amid much publicity, and found it held nothing but sand.

Here, in short, is a wry but straightforward account of the world of literary unmaskers whose bitterness against the poacher from Stratford is perhaps the strangest of all tributes to his genius.

183 pages, 9 photographs \$4.50

Also

SHAKESPEARE'S MILITARY WORLD

by Paul A. Jorgensen

358 pages, \$5.00

and

SHAKESPEARE'S TRAGIC FRONTIER

The World of His Final Tragedies

by Willard Farnham

300 pages, \$3.75

Available from

University of California Press

Berkeley 4, California

LANDMARKS OF CRITICISM

Edited by

Marcin Felheim, University of Michigan

"SHAKESPEARE THE DRAMATIST"

Una Ellis-Fermor

Proceedings of the British Academy (1948), vol. 34, pp. 81-96.

1. Proposes "to consider one question: To what degree and in virtue of what quality in his genius is Shakespeare a dramatist? What, in other words, constitutes the specifically dramatic quality in his writing and how nearly is that the native habit of his mind?"

First, we must look "at the nature of drama, or, more precisely, at the nature of dramatic genius." In a play "we expect to find at least three 'formal' characteristics: action, or a reasonably clear and coherent plot; characters, themselves the sources of this action, who convince us that they are human beings, such as we meet or might expect to meet; speech, the dialogue through which plot and character are revealed, which satisfies us that it is such speech as these men, meeting these events, might use." All three are indispensable and no one, however notable, can compensate for faults in the other two (e.g., the "noble poetry" of Yeats' *Shadowy Waters* or the "understanding of character" in Browning's *Strafford*).

Passion, Thought, Poetry

2. Further, we must examine those "generic qualities" which the great dramatist shares with other major artists (qualities which give "an imperishable and eternal significance"); "passion, thought and poetic imagination . . . survive event and circumstance and reveal man's kinship with the indestructible spirit of which great art is an image." Great drama depends upon "passion and intensity . . . for its power and immediacy . . . to move men, to touch the depths of their imaginations, to free them, and to set at work the powers of life (e.g., the "whirlwinds of madness in a Lear" or the "marmoreal calm" of the Chorus Leader in the *Oedipus at Colonus*). Directing this passion is "thought"; this "continual discipline of contemplation or reflection . . . gives us what has been called the logic of poetry." (Frequently, this "revelation" cannot be "abstracted" from the "total meaning" of the play, e.g., *Much Ado*; the "theme" of a Shakespeare play is "bottomless and endlessly extending wisdom.") Thirdly "poetry . . . that apprehension of beauty which irradiates the mind of the poet, presenting order or form as an aspect of truth, and distinguishing it at that point from the mind of the philosopher or of the saint." ("Imagery and verbal music" are its manifestations in the work of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Shakespeare; but poetry also "burns low and sometimes almost invisibly in Ibsen.")

Acting and Suffering

3. "What, then, differentiates drama from other forms of literature and the dramatist from other writers?" Answer: "the dramatist . . . is concerned with the life of man acting and suffering." His concern for "man's experience" leads to two "corollaries": sympathy ("he enters into the minds of his characters . . . and speaks from within them . . . sorrowing with him that sorrows, rejoicing with him that rejoices") and direct revelation ("expressing his passion . . . as the passion of his characters . . . ; even his sense of the poetry that irradiates his universe is at the mercy of the people of his drama"). Aeschylus gives his "comment on the world of his play" in twofold form: within the dialogue and in the choric odes, Shakespeare alone "has used the dramatic mode, and only the dramatic, for the revelation of his underlying thought."

4. "When a traditional or conventional form comes into the hands of a dramatist of genius, when passion, thought and poetic imagination have there expressed themselves in terms of sympathy and by means of direct presentation, we find the elements of a play (action, character, dialogue) transformed, so that each fulfills more than the bare functions necessary to make of the work drama rather than some other literary kind: . . . action becomes significant form; the revelation and grouping of charac-

THE ITINERANT SCHOLAR

At the Folger Shakespeare Library, Nov. 17, '58

Elizabeth I and her Successors

Sir John Neale, University of London

The quality of present-day American civilization and of the civilization of the entire English-speaking world was determined by the character of the Queen who came to England's throne on November 17, 1558.

We can now see how the fate of the Western world depended upon the slender thread of a young girl's life, the life of Elizabeth, Queen of England, who succeeded to the crown on the death of her sister Mary Tudor, who had married Philip II of Spain. Had Mary produced a child and passed on her crown to an heir whose father was King of Spain, all of North America undoubtedly would have been today an extension of Latin America. England would not have competed with Spain for a place in the sun of the New World, and the British Empire might never have come into existence.

The 17th of November, Queen Elizabeth's accession day, was once celebrated throughout England as a holiday. A new spirit dawned with the accession of Elizabeth. She chose a middle way of religion, and thus avoided the wars of religion that divided France in her time.

"It was principle, deep-rooted in instinct, that led Elizabeth to restrain the passion of an angry nation against Catholics and stand adamant against the dreams of doctrinaires. For this surely all who in any degree owe something to English civilization still remain indebted to her. Our tradition is one of tolerance." In England the fanatic has never got his way.

To Elizabeth the Queen the English owed the high quality of leadership that saved them from excesses and led them to greatness, despite a later Civil War and a "Glorious" Revolution. "It was as such a person, a great woman in a great office, with an unsurpassed gift for romantic, intrepid leadership, that she won the adoration of her subjects and conjured from individuals and the nation as a whole their utmost genius. She was, wrote Francis Osborne some fifty years later, 'the choicest artist in kingcraft that ever handled the sceptre in this northern climate'."

Greek and Elizabethan Drama—
The Difference

"The Greek dramatist created the species of fate—tragedy with the unit idea of human panic and dread in face of the unplumbed mysteries of man's origin, purpose, and destiny. Marlowe and Shakespeare, reflecting the deeper instincts of Protestant theology, incorporated into the drama the unit idea of individual responsibility. The conception was so revolutionary, the transference of the controlling will of the world from God to man so anarchic, that a new species was originated. This was the drama of individual fatality, in which fate becomes synonymous with individual character and conscience."

Archibald Henderson, *The Changing Drama*, Cincinnati, 1919, p. 45.

ter becomes the spatial aspect of the play's structure; and dialogue the vehicle for . . . understanding the relations of the world of the play and the wider universe of which that world is a part." In such manner, great drama is enabled to transcend its limitations. Aeschylus uses the choric ode "to refer outward, beyond the boundaries of the play's actual content, to a moral and spiritual universe." Shakespeare has: the soliloquy ("to let down a shaft of light into the hidden workings of the mind, to enable us to overhear its unspoken thought without in effect suspending the outward movement of the action or breaking the impression of the immediacy and reality of the dramatic world"). the imagery ("to let those same words which convey to us our necessary knowledge of feeling, thought or event convey simultaneously many other things . . ."), and the verbal music.

5. "Is there . . . anything which sets apart

COMPLETED DISSERTATIONS

Edited by

Jack R. Brown, Marshall College

Gordon Ross Smith, *Good and Evil in Shakespearean Tragedy*. Pennsylvania State University, 1956, 451 pp.

Directing attention to the text, Dr. Smith substitutes an "empirical" approach to the examination of Shakespeare's plays for the conventional "Romantic, historical, or symbolist" approaches. He concludes that Shakespeare's tragedies show three phases of development. Plays in the first group (*TA*, *RIII*, *R&J*) reveal psychologically consistent, morally responsible characters acting under social pressures.

In plays of the second group (*RII*, *JC*, *Ham.*, and *Oth.*) "an explicit moral order and social causation are abandoned" for the implication that character is inexplicable.

Tragedies of the third phase combine elements from the first two: personality remains inexplicable, but causation, particularly "parental and spousal," is re-introduced. Sympathy for the common man, especially in *Lear* and *Coriolanus*, is noted also as a new element in this final phase of Shakespeare's development as a tragic writer.

In plays of all phases, the empirical approach reveals characters who are "veritable reports of recurrent human types." Good and bad qualities arise from certain basic traits, and evil character produces inevitable tragic consequences.

Elizabeth Brock, *Shakespeare's The Merry Wives of Windsor: A History of the Text from 1623 through 1821*. University of Virginia, 1956, 623 pp.

Dr. Brock's dissertation is a study of all important editions of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* from the First Folio through the Boswell-Malone variorum of 1821.

Part I is a careful analysis of the Folio text, with emphasis on corruptions in the text and other matters requiring editorial decisions.

Part II is an account of the treatment of the text by 17th and 18th century editors. The dissertation includes an examination of each editor's statement of editorial theories and principles, and an analysis of how these are or are not exemplified in his actual practice. Principal errors in the theory and practice of early editors are discussed under four headings: (1) the practice of basing each new text on that of a recently printed edition; (2) unwarranted use of the "bad" quarto; (3) "improvements" of Shakespeare's metrics, syntax, and diction; (4) excessive freedom in conjectural emendation.

Editors in the latter half of the 18th century are found to have developed a more scholarly attitude toward treatment of the text than that displayed by most of their predecessors.

the genuine dramatist the man whose art is wholly dramatic from the first moment of its conception to the last detail of communication?" Yes: Shakespeare's identification with his characters (we can "follow the thought of a Bolingbroke through the scene before Flint Castle and the deposition scene, in both of which, but for a brief speech or two, he is silent through long periods"; this "self-identification with each and every character is not only whole but simultaneous" (Shakespeare identifies not only with each man in turn as he speaks—as in the above scenes from *Richard II*—but with each man's hidden life as well, with his thoughts while others speak). Shakespeare is "the only dramatic poet who is wholly and continuously dramatic"; he has "the universal sympathy of the genuine dramatist," for "not merely did he know what is in man, but he knew it as a dramatist"; "in the man whose genius is wholly dramatic there is no prepossession, no prejudice, no theory, because no matter of common experience is left out of the account."

WHERE SHAKESPEARE SAW MOUNTAINS

Frederick J. Pohl

Everyone asks, "Where did Shakespeare experience what his Sonnets describe?" A more fruitful question might be "Where did he have that experience?"

Sonnet 104 states that he revisited the place where his friend lived some 3 or 3½ years after he first saw him. There seems to be no evidence for or against periodic visits, or his having seen

his friend on more than the two periods of his local residence. Sonnet 109, "I return again; just to the time, not with the time exchanged," hints that the revisiting was in the same season as the first visit. It is not clear whether Sonnet 98, "From you have I been absent in the spring," precludes spring as the season of the visits. Sonnet 97 tells us "this time removed was summer's time," and another line in the same sonnet seems to preclude autumn. If young Shakespeare was a school teacher, the meetings were most likely in the winter; for the longest vacation period of the schools was 18 days at Christmas. This also would be the time he would participate in the revels, the giving of plays privately in some manor-house.

That he had been either a strolling player or a man who had paid his way by some form of display considered unbefitting a gentleman is indicated in Sonnet 110: "I have gone here and there, And made myself a motley to the view." Sonnet 111 seems to say that he had been earning his living by public performances: "Fortune . . . did not better for my life provide Than public means." Sonnet 50 speaks of a "journey," "my weary travel's end," "far the miles" on horseback. Sonnet 113 begins, "Since I left you," Shakespeare and his friend were widely separated.

The evidence as to where he saw his friend all points in one direction: a place where one could see distant "mountains." This word is not included in Caroline Spurgeon's *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us*, probably for the reason that while Shakespeare uses the word a number of times, his use of it in all but two or three instances is nondescript. For example, he has "mountain Lioness," "Strong-fixed is the house of Lancaster and like a mountain," "barren mountains," "gross as a mountain, open palpable," "goats ran from the mountains," "rocky mountains," "white his shroud as the mountain snow," "a forked mountain," "as the rudest wind, that by the top doth take the mountain pine," "turfy mountains where live nibbling sheep," and "mountain cedar." None of these is uniquely Shakespearean or vividly memorable or indicative of close familiarity with mountains, beyond what he might have learned from reading or from landscape paintings. Slightly more suggestive of his actually having seen mountains are these words: "small and indistinguishable, like far-off mountains turned into clouds." Again there is the sense of no close familiarity.

Three other references to mountains, two of which are vivid poetic figures, speak of them with greater definiteness: "The sun no sooner shall the mountains touch" in *Hamlet* 4.1.29, in the use of the plural not only indicates a range or group of mountains at a distance, instead of one mountain close up, but also indicates that the mountains are to the west. This line in *Hamlet* does not describe mountains to the east from behind which the sun rises, but mountains to the west touched by the reflected glow of color from the rising sun. The context shows the reference is to early morning.

One of the few supremely great poetic figures is in Sonnet 33:

"Full many a glorious morning have I seen
Flatter the mountain-tops with sovereign eye."
Here again Shakespeare has in mind mountains to the west of him. He has seen them repeatedly on many mornings gilded with early sunlight. Of course we must remember that Europeans, quite contrary to the Chinese, apparently did not develop a love for mountain scenery until long after Shakespeare, and hence Shakespeare's apt word "flatter" is suggestive of a lack of beauty in mountains, and helps to explain the scarcity of poetical references to them in his poetry.

The same geographical direction and the same reflected color from the rising sun are indicated in *Romeo and Juliet* by Shakespeare's

best poetic figure dealing with mountains, which also refers to plural mountains: "Jocund day Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain tops."

If imagery tells us anything, we have several new biographical hints from the figures of speech relating to mountains: 1) Shakespeare saw mountains only from a distance. If he had ever seen mountains close up, or had passed through mountain country, he would surely have been impressed, and in his imagery somewhere would be vivid figures of awesome heights, roaring cataracts, frightening avalanches, toilsome panes, animals on dizzy crags, etc. We may conclude that he never got near mountains. He never took a trip to northern Italy. 2) He saw mountains from the east, the mountains being in the distance to the west of him. 3) Sonnet 33 is evidence that it was composed, or the idea of it was conceived, at a place where there was a view of mountains to the west. This place was not Warwickshire, or in or near London, or in the eastern half of England. 4) The only shire indicated in connection with Shakespeare's use of mountains is Lancashire ("strong-fixed is the house of Lancaster and like a mountain").

E. K. Chambers in *Sources for a Biography of Shakespeare*, p. 11, says of our poet: "It is possible that he is to be identified with a William Shakeshafte, who in 1581 was a player in a company mentioned by one Alexander Houghton of Lea in Lancashire." Shakeshafte was a form of his name which Shakespeare's grandfather had employed. In this connection it is interesting to note that Alexander Houghton's half-brother, Thomas Houghton, master of Lea Hall, built a new family seat in 1565, Houghton Tower, which is at an altitude of 556 feet, with only low ground, Houghton Bottom, etc., between it and the seacoast, and that from the hill on which Houghton Tower stands, there is a view to the westward of the peaks of the Lake Country and of the far-off Welsh mountains.

There is a direct connection between the players employed by the Lancashire families and Shakespeare's acting company in London. In 1580 Lord Derby's servants (an acting company) came to Stratford. 1581—the will of Alexander Houghton of Lea names William Shakeshafte and commends him to his half-brother Thomas Houghton and/or to Sir Thomas Hesketh of Rufford. Thomas Houghton was auditor to the Earl of Derby. 1587—"Sir Thomas Hesketh's players went awaie." In the same year the Earl of Leicester's men visited the Earl of Derby in Lancashire. 1588—"Sir Thomas Hesketh died. Lord Strange's men and the Earl of Leicester's men merged into one acting company. Later, possibly the same year, Derby's (Strange's) merged with the Queen's. William Shakespeare may have been with the Queen's Players at Knowsley, the seat of the Earl of Derby in Lancashire. 1589—Thomas Houghton was killed at Lea Hall. This year Lord Strange's men were at least part of the time in London. 1591—Lord Strange's men were in possession of the Rose Theatre. 1594—Lord Strange's men passed to the two Careys, the 1st and the 2nd Lords Hunsdon, Lord Chamberlain. William Shakespeare was with this acting company. There is too much tie-in to discard this chain of evidence. It is more than probable that Shakespeare was well acquainted with the Lancashire families.

Mr. Pohl, formerly a Professor at Ohio Wesleyan is known as a "geographical detective." *The Lost Discovery: Uncovering The Track of The Vikings in America* was published by Norton in 1952. SNL will publish his article on the identity of Mr. W. H. in the next issue.

Have You Checked The Renewal Date?

Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare

Vol. II: Comedies, 1597-1603

Edited by Geoffrey Bullough

Expertly selected and introduced, here are reprinted the sources and analogues from which Shakespeare created his poems and plays. This second book in a series gives backgrounds for the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *All's Well That Ends Well*, and *Measure for Measure*. About Vol. I the *Times Literary Supplement* said, "There have been previous collections of such material, but none so convenient and complete as this promises to be . . . Most generous, well set out, and skillfully introduced."

\$7.50

Thomas Middleton

Richard Hindry Barker

In the first general study of Middleton, the personality of the dramatist as a writer is revealed, as elements of theme, characterization, and style that are essentially his emerge.

\$4.50

The Broken Compass

Edward B. Partridge

Examining the theories of imagery from the time of the Elizabethans to the present, Dr. Partridge evolves a workable approach to the often complicated imagery of Jonson in his major comedies.

\$4.25

Renaissance

Theory of Love

John Charles Nelson

Dr. Nelson traces the history of love treatises and commentaries on verses from the Middle Ages through the Renaissance and shows the position that Giordano Bruno's *Eroici Furori* occupies in this literary tradition.

\$5.50

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

2960 Broadway New York 27, N. Y.

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

G. R. Elliott, *Dramatic Providence in Macbeth*. Princeton University Press, 1958. 234 pp.

Since his retirement from Amherst College as Folger Professor of English, Dr. G. R. Elliott has found time to bring to fruition his lifelong study of Shakespeare. In 1951 his *Scourge and Minister*, a study of *Hamlet*, laid down the theme and method of his subsequent *Flaming Minister* (1953), an examination of *Othello*, and of this latest, *Dramatic Providence in Macbeth*. In each volume, an initial essay admirably lays out the scope of the book and establishes the author's thesis. The bulk of the book is then given over to a scene by scene exegesis of the play, thus treating the reader to an exhaustive proof of the thesis.

In this new study, Dr. Elliott wishes to present a fresh reading of *Macbeth*. It is his contention that *Macbeth* embodies Shakespeare's ultimate tragic vision of a man rich in human-kindness who yet succumbs to evil. His discussion draws upon the great tradition of Christian humanism, placing Shakespeare in the stream that runs from Dante through Milton. Dr. Elliott demonstrates how natural benevolence cannot withstand supernatural evil without the aid of supernatural good in the form of grace. As in his previous volumes the overriding theme of pride is again developed. Wrong pride is in the Renaissance view a combination of Original Sin and classical hubris.

His concern with man's innate sinful pride as a source of tragedy places Dr. Elliott among those critics who stress the Christian elements in the works of Shakespeare, but he wisely refrains from trying to make his thesis reveal to what doctrines Shakespeare the man might have subscribed. He resists the temptation of pushing the father image of Duncan and the redeeming figure of Malcolm, his son, to a parallel with God as Father-Son. For him Christian myth is but a central way of seeing life for both Shakespeare and his audience.

Dr. Elliott has constantly in mind how the scenes might be played. If he is sometimes too minute (for example, in *Macbeth's* killing of young Siward in Act V), he usually keeps the elements of dramatic suspense and audience reaction clearly before the reader.

The breadth of Dr. Elliott's scholarship is further shown by his sensitivity to the poetic values of the play. Dr. Elliott is sharply aware of the effects of metrics, of the interplay of imagery, of the use of key words in Act V when images of the "bloody childe" and the "armed head" reach their final shaping. He constantly holds to his belief that *Macbeth* is "the author's most subtly and profoundly dramatic poem."

For this study, Dr. Elliott has meticulously followed the conservative text of the First Folio, but in some of his subtler readings of lines, he trusts rather unquestionably in the capitalization and punctuation of the folio. On the whole the choice of text is sound.

Dr. Elliott's achievement as a guide to the world of *Macbeth* is his ability to leave the reader with a fresh view of a familiar play. No reader will ever be able to see *Macbeth* only in relation to evil but will also be aware of how grace pursues *Macbeth* through such good characters as Duncan, Banquo, and Macduff. And *Macbeth's* murders will be seen more clearly as frantic attempts to "murder" his own conscience. Finally *Macbeth's* greatness will be seen in his final acceptance of his damnation; no hypocrite, *Macbeth* has in Dr. Elliott's words "at least the grace not to claim for his doings any tinge of Grace."

Donald A. Sears, *Upsala College*

Elizabethan and Modern Drama— The Difference

"A Shakespearean maintains that the fault is in us that we are underlings. An Ibsen asserts that the fault is in Society."

Archibald Henderson, *The Changing Drama, Cincinnati*, 1919, p. 15.

W. Bridges-Adams, *The Irresistible Theatre*. Cleveland World Publishing Co., 1957, pp. 446, \$6.00.

Like Matthew Arnold, W. Bridges-Adams has found that the "theatre is irresistible." Mr. Bridges-Adams directed the Memorial Theatre at Stratford-upon-Avon from 1919 to 1935, producing thirty-six plays during the period but the current volume admittedly scants Shakespeare with the excuse being that the general reader for whom the volume is intended most likely knows more about the Bard than he does of the others. Although the volume is more than the "vulgarization" the author modestly admits in his introduction, the chapter on Shakespeare rambles from subject to subject but it does not tell why Shakespeare was "irresistible theatre." It discusses only the heresies, the sources, the folio, Shakespeare's private life, and contemporary allusions. There are numerous references to Shakespeare throughout the volume, but the promise of the title is unfulfilled. If one disregards the promise of the title, the book fares much better. In a lively style the author begins with a definition of drama and goes on to survey the subject from the conquest to the closing of the theatres. If not as informative as Chambers and Bentley it is easier to read. The index carries citations to about 350 plays and 150 dramatists. There are footnotes, bibliography, and an appendix giving the subject-matter of biblical history as presented in the extant cycles. Subsequent volumes will bring the history up to date.

E. J. West, ed., *Shaw on Theatre*. New York, Hill and Wang, 1958, pp. xi-306, \$3.95.

Forty-nine passages of dramatic criticism have been brought together in this volume edited by Professor West of the University of Colorado; 8 of the passages are directly concerned with Shakespeare. In "The Dying Tongue of Great Elizabeth" he finds that for Mr. Tree "Shakespeare does not exist at all. Confronted with a Shakespearean play, he stares into a ghastly vacuum, yet stares unterrified, . . . quite prepared to find the thing simply an ancient, dusty, mouldy, empty house which it is his business to furnish, decorate, and housewarm." Fourteen years later, in 1919, he speaks "On Cutting Shakespeare" and deplores the excesses of a Cibber or Daly as much as the excessive verisimilitude of a Granville-Barker. After a lively blanket-toss of almost every producer of the day he concludes: "The simple thing to do with a Shakespeare play is to perform it. The alternative is to let it alone."

In 1920 he feels called upon to deny that he is a Shakespeare thief, and defends himself as a "Classic" who plays "the old game in the old way, on the old chessboard, with the old pieces, just as Shakespeare did." In 1921 Shaw addresses himself to the problem of a standard text for Shakespeare, and concludes that we need some kind of a standard notation for speech like that of music to really recall pronunciation, pause, etc., with any degree of positiveness. He begins a letter to John Barrymore about his *Hamlet* in 1925 quietly, but is soon pointing out that the "actor who undertakes to improve" Shakespeare's "plays undertakes thereby to excel . . . in two professions in both of which the highest success is extremely rare." Discussing Barry Sullivan's *Hamlet* in 1948, he says that Sullivan "presented himself as what *Hamlet* was: a being of a different and higher order from Laertes and the rest." The impression from all the discussions is of enormous good sense combined with esthetic sensitivity to make first rate criticism. A bibliography of uncollected criticism and an index complete the book.

As Tall A Man As Any's In Illyria

The John Hodgkinson who acted *Othello* in Philadelphia in 1792, *Macbeth* in Boston in 1795, and *Hamlet* in New York in 1797 was six feet ten inches tall!

M. M. Mahood, *Shakespeare's Wordplay*. London, Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1957, pp. 192, \$2.52.

Professor Mahood of University College, Ibadan, points out that Shakespeare found "plenty of authority" for his puns in Scripture, all the rhetoricians, neo-classical textbooks, and Puttenham. Only in our age, she believes, are his puns being fully savored again. Occasionally Shakespeare's wordplay helps establish links between "bad" Quartos and good texts; indeed an ear for wordplay can often justify an emendation of a unique text as with Theobald's "curl by nature" for "coole my nature" in *TN*, I.iii.107. Sometimes Shakespeare uses quibbles, as in the beginning of *JC*, to "tune up the audience's responsiveness to . . . Marullus's outburst of rhetoric"; elsewhere, as in *LLL*, he uses wordplay to "develop the contrast between the simpletons, who are at the mercy of words . . . and the sophisticated wits who show their mastery of words," puns become puns of character.

Professor Mahood, then, turns to analyses of the wordplay in *R&J*, *R II*, *The Sonnets*, *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *WT*, not because they "are most rich in wordplay, but they are ones in which the wordplay" offers "a valuable means of access to the heart of the drama." Shakespeare begins by boldly questioning the truth of words. For his tragic heroes, "words lose their meaning," but "the truth of poetry, the validity of the conceptual life in words, is reasserted . . . in the world built from Prospero's words of magic." Herein Shakespeare finds "the truth of what we are."

Franklin M. Dickey, *Not Wisely But Too Well*. San Marino, Calif., The Huntington Library, 1957, pp. ix-205, \$5.00.

Professor Dickey of the University of New Mexico feels that most critics have paid too little attention to "Shakespeare's love tragedy as the expression of Renaissance aesthetic and philosophical thought," and he "attempts to trim the boat by taking the stated opinions of Elizabethan poets, moralists, and literary critics quite seriously."

After an introductory chapter, Dr. Dickey discusses the ethical and esthetic aims of drama and the divided nature of love. Secure in the discovery that to the Elizabethan love meant "not one but many things," and that "burning love" was not considered "the purifying flame," but rather the way to disaster, he turns to an analysis of love in Chapter IV. The four aspects of love, i.e., delightful folly, the torments of melancholy, the expense of spirit, and the kinship of lust and murder are then traced through *V & A* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, *R & J*, *T & C*, and *A & C*. He finds that in *A & C* the "contemptus mundi" which other playwrights preach in vain follows upon our awe at the sight of the most glittering world conceivable lying in ruins."

King Henry VIII, ed. by R. A. Foakes, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1957, pp. 1xv-215, \$3.85.

Othello, ed. by M. R. Ridley, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1958, pp. 1xx-246, \$3.85.

Both of these editions differ in most respects from their antecedent volumes: the text of *Othello* has been completely re-edited, and based on Q1 rather than the Folio while that of *H VIII* has been considerably revised; the notes of both volumes have been redone; the Introductions include discussions of all sorts of problems which may confront the earnest reader; the nine appendices to *Othello* discuss variants of all kinds in the texts, punctuation, Alice Walker's theory, and Cinthio's narrative; the two to *H VIII* discuss the burning of the *Globe*, and sources. The printing is large and easy to read, and the makeup of the book attractive. The "junior Variorum" tradition of editing, established in the earlier volumes of this series, is successfully continued in *Othello* and *H VIII*.

Studies in Honor of

Thomas W. Baldwin, University of Illinois

INFLUENCE OF THE
EUPHUISTIC NOVEL

Of the four literary traditions important in Shakespeare's development: Senecan tragedy, the tradition of the Fall of Princes, the euphuistic novel, and the Arcadian novel, "clearly the euphuistic novel is the most important," concludes Ludwig Borinski of the University of Hamburg. The euphuistic novel created by George Pettie after the models of Belleforest and Aeneas Sylvius "became one of the main starting points of Shakespeare's work." *Two Gentlemen of Verona* "has all the characteristics of the euphuistic novel." The influence of the euphuistic novel is "strongest," however, in *Lucrece* and *Venus and Adonis*, the former in plot and structure having "much in common with" Pettie's *Sinorix and Camma*. Some of the main motifs of Shakespeare's later work can also be traced to the euphuistic novel: the idea of unfaithfulness and ingratitude, the loathing of illegitimate sexuality, and the seduction speech of the euphuists and Shakespeare's early poems, which "is developed into the great demagogic speeches of *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus*, and the maternal insinuations of Iago in the third act of *Othello*." Such literary influences do not "explain" Shakespeare, but "they are significant nevertheless." ["The Origins of the Euphuistic Novel and its Significance for Shakespeare," *Studies in Honor of T. W. Baldwin* (University of Illinois Press, 1958), 38-52.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY—THE NEW SCIENCE

The special importance of the "new epistemology" in humanistic scholarship is noted by Hardin Craig, the method of "total comprehension—complete clarity and probability in general conception and complete concinnity in all the parts." The new science of textual criticism "operates by means of groups or families toward an archetype or supposedly perfect original from the hand of an author." However, difficulty arises when the method of classical textual criticism is "applied mechanically" to Elizabethan dramatic texts, because they "were not transmitted from copyist to copyist through the centuries but came about in other circumstances." Therefore, the "special conditions" at work in Elizabethan times—multiple versions, revisions, abridgements—must be considered.

Thus, debate over the relation of the *Hamlet* Q1 (1603) text to Q2 (1604-5), and to failure to [consider] all the factors necessary for the formulation of a correct conclusion." Q1 arbitrates between the two other texts only if it "retains original readings from a version basal to both Q2 and F." Although original readings in the playbooks of *Richard II* and *I Henry IV* appeared in the folio, a "literal application of the theory of textual variants . . . suggested to scholars that the folio version was set from a quarto with which it agreed in certain correct readings," although other differences necessitated inventing many other "costly and unnecessary" processes. In the "textual history" of the two plays, Craig concludes, "agreements, as well as . . . differences, may have come about in another way than transcription." [Criticism of Elizabethan Dramatic Texts," *Studies in Honor of T. W. Baldwin* (University of Illinois Press, 1958), 3-8.]

Denis Meadows, *Elizabethan Quintet*, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1957, pp. xv-304, \$3.50.

The members of Mr. Meadows' quintet are Sir Francis Walsingham, Robert Persons, John Dee, Mary Frith, and Sir John Harington. All of them are figures of considerable bibliographical interest, not the least of whom is Mary Frith, better known as the Roaring Girl, who wore Dutch slops, led her own gang and faced a penitential sermon in her white gown, her penance assured by the three bottles of sack she had consumed. One wishes that the publishers might have included pictures of the subjects of these five engaging vignettes.

BRUTUS JUSTIFIED

G. Blakemore Evans of the University of Illinois calls attention to a hitherto unnoticed letter by one "T. Killigrew" (not the Restoration dramatist or his son) in which Killigrew, as his contemporaries, Rymmer, Dennis, and Gildon, "improves" Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. In *The Problem of Brutus: An Eighteenth Century Solution*, Evans illustrates the "kind of critical climate which nourished Killigrew's reactions and suggestions." Killigrew finds Brutus not "good" enough, Caesar not "bad" enough. His solution, "typical of seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century 'improvers,'" is to "justify" Brutus by showing him "giving Caesar at least two opportunities to declare himself for the general good, in the process blackening the character of Caesar by allowing the audience to witness his tyrannical reception of Brutus's overtures." Killigrew, to whom Brutus is "Certainly a defective Character at best," offers a Brutus activated by "reason," a Caesar failing to be "mov'd by reason," thereby reducing the "complexities of Shakespearean character and motivation to an edifying but dull 'simplicity.'" ["The Problem of Brutus: An Eighteenth Century Solution," *Studies in Honor of T. W. Baldwin*, ed. Don Cameron Allen. (University of Illinois Press, 1958), 229-236.]

(To Be Concluded in the Next Issue)

Digest of Periodical Reviews

Bush, Geoffrey. *Shakespeare and the Natural Condition*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1956.

" . . . some of the acutest of Elizabethan minds were troubled by the ambiguities of 'nature'—the facts of life as open to observation, and the laws in terms of which life becomes intelligible and significant. . . . Shakespeare, says Mr. Bush, took his stand neither with those who professed concern only with the fact of natural things . . . nor with those who sought to impose a pattern of values on the diversity of the human scene; he was faithful to the double aspect of experience, both to the stubborn facts and to the human demand for meanings. . . . In his supple and responsive, but sometimes slightly oracular, development of this theme Mr. Bush seems to me truer to the imaginative vision of the plays than those who see them as a purely secular exploration of experience, or those who . . . find in them overtly Christian meanings. It is a pity . . . that a book containing so much original insight can at times both irritate and confuse."

L. C. Knights, *Review of English Studies* (Aug. '58) 316-17.

Luthi, Max. *Shakespeares Dramen*. Berlin, De Gruyter, 1957. M. 20 \$2.50.

" . . . a separate chapter is devoted to each play in the canon . . . the author's critical method justifies this all-inclusiveness. For he brings out most clearly how the plays illuminate each other and how much is gained by a comparative approach . . . His main purpose is to show up dominant motifs in each play, to trace patterns of events, and by this means to discover the play's deepest and fullest meaning . . . Though clearly familiar with much recent criticism, he makes little reference to it but achieves surprisingly often originality of perception coupled with persuasiveness. He makes full allowance for Shakespeare's infinite variety and complexity and never over-simplifies, though he often over-subtilizes. Straining his eyes for patterns in the design of each play, he inevitably finds them and, while sometimes illuminating, they frequently seem forced . . . The least persuasive aspect of the book . . . is the recurrent use of the terms 'medieval,' 'Renaissance,' and 'baroque' to signify clearly defined and mutually exclusive aesthetic concepts as well as artistic epochs."

Ernest Schanzer *Mod. Lang. Rev.* LIII (July '58) 425-6.

Review of Periodical:

RITUALISM IN KING LEAR

Though the artificiality of ritual gives a dramatist more freedom to heighten his language than he has elsewhere, ritual has certain drawbacks as well, says William Frost. It "dampens down" the oscillations of personality, subduing them to the exigencies of what is personal. Mr. Frost feels this when he reads Gertrude's obituary for Ophelia. Ritual is also mechanical, and there is danger that the dramatist will interrupt it mechanically, as Shakespeare does when he makes Richard II stop the trial by arms and when he makes Claudio refuse to marry Hero. This "staginess" is also present in the trial scene of *The Merchant of Venice*. In these cases ritual is "running away with the play."

The ritualism of the opening scene of *King Lear* has been attacked by modern critics because of its stiffness and frigidity. But Mr. Frost finds much to defend in the scene. First, it is an allegory—two contests of affection, the first between Lear's three daughters, the second between France and Burgundy. Also the ceremony of the scene is in keeping with the "folkloristic" nature of the story. It came from old chronicles and can be treated like a fairy story. Moreover, the ritualism produces the effect of "nightmarish inevitability" which is useful for this type of tragedy.

Scene I is thrown into high relief by the realistic nature of the rest of the play. The casual colloquial dialogues reverse the mythical atmosphere of the opening ritual. This contrast appears in the scene in Goneril's household, where we feel that we are "going backstage." The scene in which the mad King Lear imagines that he is trying his daughters is like a parody of the opening ritual. The final contrast is between the opening and the closing of the play. Here Lear and Cordelia are no longer figures in an allegory, but human beings. They have passed beyond ritual. ["Shakespeare's Rituals and the Opening of *King Lear*," *The Hudson Review*, X:4 (Winter '57-58) 577-85.]

SHAKESPEARE'S PUNS

Beginning with Professor T. M. Raysor's statements in *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism* (1930), Sylvan Barnet of Tufts University criticizes Coleridge's "argument of appropriateness" in defense of Shakespeare's puns. Though observing that "Professor Raysor's praise of Coleridge's . . . justification of wordplay in tragedy . . . is a significant contribution to Shakespeare criticism," Dr. Barnet points out that Coleridge tended "to justify in terms of character all puns he accepts." "Is it not possible," he reflects, ". . . that their [Shakespeare's characters'] puns are . . . [sometimes] attempts at producing an effect beyond that evoked by a mere reproduction of life?" Coleridge's concept "must be modified, and wordplay must be partly studied against a background of Renaissance rhetorical devices." Dr. Barnet reminds us that Coleridge "does not comment on hundreds of puns, partly through ignorance . . . , partly through carelessness, and partly through squeamishness," and concludes that Coleridge's "explanation, though the best at its time, is no longer a safe foundation for modern study." ["Coleridge on Puns: a note to his Shakespeare Criticism," *The Journal of English and German Philology*, LVI, 4 (October 1957), 602-609.]

HAMLET'S ARTS

Manfred Weidhorn, in an admirably composed article, demonstrates that Hamlet's indirect methods of communication—satire in his approach to Polonius, music (the recorder) in his dealings with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, painting in his appeal to Gertrude, masque and drama in the play-within-the-play—enable him to make contact with "the peculiar murmurs of another's heart" as he can not by simple direct expression. Thus, Mr. Weidhorn concludes, the major arts have been utilized by Hamlet to circumvent the propriety which suppresses truths that hurt. ["Hamlet and the Arts," *Notes and Queries* (New Series), V:2 (February 1958), 52-53.]

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

A LINGUIST LOOKS AT SHAKESPEARE'S TEXT

Observing that editors of Shakespeare's plays are often not linguists, Hilda M. Hulme of University College, London, shows how linguists can interpret and add to the information contained in the *New English Dictionary* when a word is to be explained.

In the early texts *Portia* is hedged by her father's "wit." The usual substitution of "will" for "wit" is unnecessary. The verb *wit* meant "to bequeath" in Shakespeare's time, and if this meaning for the verb is found in colloquial literary English "we can be fairly sure that the noun *wit* was heard in the spoken language"—and it may have been written too, since "there is plenty of evidence that the written record is incomplete or insufficient." The retention of "wit" makes possible a double meaning.

In *I HIV*, (II.4c.437) the Hostess's admiring comparison of Falstaff's acting to that of these "harlotry" Players indicates that the *N.E.D.*'s definition of "scurvy, worthless" is inadequate, since, in collocation with *Players* the adjective would indicate "the survival of the itinerant jester of a century earlier." Often the sense of an entire passage can give the clue to the meaning of a word. Hamlet's words "No, let the candied tongue lick absurd pomp." (III.2.65) indicates that *absurd* means, not "ridiculous" but "tasteless." Etymologically *ab* is an intensive and *surdus* can mean "That which hath no savour," according to Cooper's *Thesaurus*.

Localizations offered by the NED and by the *English Dialect Dictionary* do not hold good for Elizabethan and Jacobean English. When in the quarto of *T and C*, II.3.86 Agamemnon says that Achilles "sate our Messengers," there is no need to amend "sate," since it could mean "ignored, set aside, disregarded." The NED and the EDD indicate that the word was used in this sense only in Scotland, but "words and senses listed as Scottish by the NED are found in English records of Shakespeare's time." ["Shakespeare's Text—Some Notes on Linguistic Procedure and its Relevance to Textual Criticism," *English Studies*, XXXIX:2 (April '58) 49-56.]

CHAPMAN AND SHAKESPEARE

Chapman's *Homer* contains prefatory verses addressed "To The High Borne Prince of Man," eight lines of which J. W. Lever of the University of Khartoum finds strongly resembling Shakespeare's Sonnet LV ("Not marble, nor the gilded monuments of princes"). Although the inspiration for both these lines and the sonnet is clearly Horace and Ovid, Chapman and Shakespeare resemble each other rather than their sources in *Prince's* (princes), *statue* (statues), *Marble*, *gold* (gilded), *Oblivion's* (oblivious), "Till . . . dead men rise" (till the judgment that yourself arise). Lever believes that Shakespeare influenced Chapman. One problem in the assignment of influence is that of dates: "The prefatory verses first appeared in Chapman's translation of twelve books of the *Iliad*, *Homer Prince of Poets*, . . . between . . . Nov. 14, 1608 and . . . April 8, 1611. Shakespeare's *Sonnets* was entered by Thorpe on May 20, 1609, and published in the same year." Reasoning from the history and the practices of printing, Lever concludes: "Moreover, dedicatory verse could for technical reasons be added to a book at a late stage of printing, whereas the late insertion of one sonnet in the middle of a collection would have occasioned the printers much difficulty. For such reasons, if for no others . . . The inspiration of Ovid persists through a large number of Shakespeare's sonnets, but it is not apparent elsewhere in these prefatory verses of Chapman. . . . I believe that Chapman's lines to Prince Henry were influenced by Shakespeare's sonnet to his friend, and not *vice versa*." ["Chapman and Homer", *Notes and Queries*, New Series, V:3 (March 1958), 99-100.]

Ned B. Allen, University of Delaware; Barbara Alden; Nancy Lee Riffe, U. of Ky.; Gordon W. O'Brien, Youngstown Univ.; Peter J. Seng, Northwestern Univ.; Joseph H. Summerell, University of Rochester; Gordon Ross Smith, Penna. State U., Bibliographer.

THE DATE OF OTHELLO

Professor Marvin Rosenberg of the University of California supports Malone's dating of *Othello* in 1604. In the first place, he observes that the authenticity of the Cunningham papers on which Malone's date was based has been convincingly supported by Mr. A. E. Stamp, Deputy Keeper of the Public Records in England. In the second place, Professor Rosenberg had observed that Ben Jonson made the performers of his *Masque of Blackness* blackmoors at the express desire of Queen Anne. This was done during the winter of 1604-5, and it seems likely that the Queen's interest in blackmoors may have caused Shakespeare to write *Othello* at that time, just as Elizabeth's interests earlier caused him to write *The Merry Wives* and (according to Leslie Hotson) *Twelfth Night*. ["On the Dating of *Othello*," *English Studies*, XXXIX:2 (April '58) 72-4.]

OTHELLO'S SPEECH

Though *Othello* declares that he is rude in his speech, an actor should not deliver most of his lines in a rude manner, says Professor Henry J. Webb of the University of Utah. *Othello* is very different from the Bastard in *King John*, Hotspur in *Henry IV*, part I, Kent in *King Lear*, Fluellen in *Henry V*, and Coriolanus. The speech of these characters is really rude, and Shakespeare makes sure that audiences—and actors—won't overlook this fact by having other characters comment upon it.

But *Othella* is seldom blunt. Instead of employing words which demand a clipped staccato method of delivery or arranging less harsh words in rough phrases, *Othello* selects and arranges words which require dignity and solemnity in their presentation.

Professor Webb thinks that the discrepancy between *Othello's* claim that his speech is rude and the fact that it is not can be explained. At the start of the play, he says, Shakespeare wished to represent *Othello* as a man the audience should like—a plain, blunt, honest soldier. He failed to fit *Othello's* language to the type, however, because he wanted to eliminate the elements of hot-headedness and impulsiveness that had been in Hotspur and Fluellen. An impulsive *Othello* would have made Iago less diabolical and cunning. Then, too, language like that of a Fluellen would have eradicated much of the beauty and poetry of the play and would have injured "the whole tragic tone." Finally, it would have taken away some of the shock from such scenes as III, 4, in which *Othello* does speak rudely. ["Rude Am I in My Speech," *English Studies*, XXXIX:2 (April '58) 67-72.]

A STYLISTIC DEVICE IN OTHELLO

The use of paired words is a mannerism as characteristic of *Othello* as the habit of repeating a word or phrase is of Hamlet, says Walter Nash. Such expressions as "the flinty and steel couch of war," "a natural and prompt alacrity," "place and exhibition," "accommodations and besort," all of which occur in one of *Othello's* early speeches (I, 3, 229-239) are used by him much oftener than by other characters in this or other plays. They are not, of course, peculiar to him, and Mr. Nash gives examples of paired words in *Measure for Measure*, *Macbeth*, and in the speeches of another character in *Othello*—Iago. Iago's use of the device suggests the man aping the master. It may be significant, too, that, after he has fallen under Iago's spell, *Othello* uses paired words much less often than before—his language having changed with his character. Two examples of paired words in the final act suggest the emergence of the old *Othello*: "one entire and perfect chrysolite" and "a malignant and a turban'd Turk." *Othello* and Iago account for all but 10 of the 53 examples of the pairing device in the play.

["Paired Words in *Othello's* Shakespeare's Use of a Stylistic Device," *English Studies*, XXXIX:2 (April '58) 62-7.]

1958 Copyright

SHAKESPEARE

21 Play Edition, Revised

Hardin Craig

The text of twenty-one plays, with an unusually complete and authentic presentation of the life and times of Shakespeare. Illustrations and end-sheet maps of England and London have been added in this revision.

1216 pages \$6.75 list

SCOTT, FORESMAN
AND COMPANY

Chicago Atlanta Dallas Palo Alto
Fair Lawn, N. J.

THE ANTICK DISPOSITION

Frank Doggett explains that Hamlet's poem to Ophelia "gives an instance of Hamlet's 'antick disposition' and prepares for Hamlet's manner in the scene with Ophelia that Polonius is planning." Analyzing the four lines in which "doubt" is a common element, Mr. Doggett shows that the first three by their parallel structures enforce "a consistent meaning for the word 'doubt.'" Since one calls truth a liar, the fourth line, "But never doubt I love," contradicts its apparent statement. Thus "the truth confounds itself forever,"—as Mr. Doggett adds, "appropriately enough" for Hamlet's "antick disposition." ["Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, II, ii, 116-119," *The Explicator*, XVI, 4 (January 1958), No. 25.]